

Exhibit B

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

SONAL N. MEHTA (SBN 222086)

Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING

HALE AND DORR LLP

2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400

Palo Alto, California 94306

Telephone: (650) 858-6000

DAVID Z. GRINGER (*pro hac vice*)

David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING

HALE AND DORR LLP

7 World Trade Center

250 Greenwich Street

New York, New York 10007

Telephone: (212) 230-8800

ARI HOLTZBLATT (*pro hac vice*)

Ari.Holtzblatt@wilmerhale.com

MOLLY M. JENNINGS (*pro hac vice*)

Molly.Jennings@wilmerhale.com

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING

HALE AND DORR LLP

1875 Pennsylvania Ave NW

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 663-6000

Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al., on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware
Corporation headquartered in California,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-08570-JD

**DEFENDANT META
PLATFORMS, INC.’S
OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES
TO ADVERTISER PLAINTIFFS’
SECOND SET OF
INTERROGATORIES**

Judge: Hon. James Donato

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

1 applicable interrogatory limit.

2 8. Meta objects to Instruction 13 as vague and ambiguous to the extent that it conflicts
3 with Instruction 3, as discussed above. Meta further objects to this Instruction to the extent it
4 characterizes the duty to supplement as broader than the duty imposed by Federal Rule of Civil
5 Procedure 26(e). Meta will comply with its duty to supplement pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
6 Procedure 26(e).
7

SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORIES**INTERROGATORY NO. 4**

10 Identify and describe, with specificity, all information and data—including but not limited
11 to call logs, video logs, text message logs, text message content, app usage information, and battery
12 or power consumption logs—that Facebook obtained through, or derived from, Onavo, Onavo
13 apps (*e.g.*, Onavo Protect), or Meta’s Onavo team.
14

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

16 Meta incorporates by reference its General Objections and its Objections to Definitions
17 and Instructions. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory because it fails to describe with
18 reasonable particularity the information sought. Specifically, Meta objects to the phrases
19 “obtained through,” “derived from,” “Onavo,” and “Meta’s Onavo team” as undefined, vague and
20 ambiguous. Meta further objects to the Interrogatory as facially overbroad and ambiguous to the
21 extent that it asks Meta to describe “all information and data,” which has multiple meanings,
22 without limitation in subject matter or scope as to the information sought but instead only with
23 reference to a list of non-limiting examples. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory as seeking
24 discovery of information that is neither relevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this action
25 nor proportional to the needs of the case. For example, it is unclear how an identification and
26 description of “all information and data” “obtained through, or derived from, Onavo” is relevant
27
28

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

1 to support Advertisers’ claims or how the scope of the information sought in this Interrogatory is
2 relevant or proportional to those claims. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent
3 that it seeks information not in Meta’s possession, custody or control, and seeks information in a
4 form that Meta does not maintain in the ordinary course of business.

5 Subject to and without waiving its objections, Meta responds that Facebook [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED]
28

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

1 [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED]

13 Discovery is ongoing, and Meta reserves the right to supplement its response as its

14 investigation progresses.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5

16 Identify and describe, with specificity, all data, including what Meta internally refers to as

17 “signal,” “intent,” “identity,” or “offsite signal” data, that Meta received from Google, Netflix,

18 eBay, or Amazon, respectively, pursuant to agreements or otherwise.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

21 Meta incorporates by reference its General Objections and its Objections to Definitions

22 and Instructions. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory because it fails to describe with

23 reasonable particularity the information sought. Specifically, Meta objects to this Interrogatory as

24 vague and ambiguous because it relies on the undefined terms “signal,” “intent,” “identity,” or

25 “offsite signal” data. Meta further objects to the phrase “pursuant to agreements or otherwise” as

26 vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Meta further objects to the Interrogatory as facially overbroad

27

28

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

1 and ambiguous to the extent that it asks Meta to describe “all data,” which has multiple meanings,
2 without limitation in subject matter or scope as to the information sought but instead only a list of
3 non-limiting examples. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory as seeking discovery of
4 information that is neither relevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this action nor
5 proportional to the needs of the case. For example, it is unclear how an identification and
6 description of “[a]ll data” received from Google, Netflix, eBay, or Amazon is relevant to support
7 Advertisers’ claims or how the scope of the information sought in this Interrogatory is relevant or
8 proportional to those claims. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks
9 information not in Meta’s possession, custody or control, and seeks information in a form that
10 Meta does not maintain in the ordinary course of business. Meta further objects to this
11 interrogatory to the extent it seeks the confidential information of non-parties to this litigation or
12 information that Meta is under an obligation to a third party not to disclose. Meta further objects
13 to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege,
14 the work product doctrine, or other applicable privilege or protection.

17 Based on the foregoing objections, Meta responds that it is unable to provide a response to
18 Interrogatory No. 5 as framed. Meta is willing to meet and confer to discuss the relevance and
19 scope of this Interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6

22 Identify and describe, with specificity, all storage systems and databases, including
23 Facebook’s Hive, in which user data collected through Onavo or its apps was at any time or is
24 currently stored.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

26 Meta incorporates by reference its General Objections and its Objections to Definitions
27 and Instructions. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory because it fails to describe with
28

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

1 reasonable particularity the information sought. Specifically, Meta objects to the phrase “all
2 storage systems and databases” and “data collected through Onavo or its apps” as vague and
3 ambiguous. Meta further objects to the Interrogatory as facially overbroad and ambiguous to the
4 extent that it asks Meta to describe “all storage systems and databases” where such data “was at
5 any time” stored, without limitation for relevance or proportionality. Meta further objects to this
6 Interrogatory as seeking discovery of information that is neither relevant to the claims or defenses
7 of any party to this action nor proportional to the needs of the case. For example, it is unclear how
8 an identification and description of where data currently is, or at any time ever was, stored is
9 relevant to Advertisers’ claims or how the scope of the information sought in this Interrogatory is
10 relevant or proportional to those claims. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent
11 that it seeks information not in Meta’s possession, custody or control, and seeks information in a
12 form that Meta does not maintain in the ordinary course of business. Meta further objects to this
13 Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege, the work
14 product doctrine, or other applicable privilege or protection.

17 Subject to and without waiving its objections, Meta responds that [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]

19 Discovery is ongoing, and Meta reserves the right to supplement its response as its
20 investigation progresses.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7

23 Identify and describe, with specificity, all data and AI/machine learning models obtained,
24 derived, trained and/or validated using data collected by Onavo or through Onavo apps (e.g.,
25 Onavo Protect).

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:
27
28

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

Meta incorporates by reference its General Objections and its Objections to Definitions and Instructions. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory because it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the information sought. Specifically, Meta objects the phrase “all data and AI/machine learning models” and “obtained, derived, trained and/or validated” as vague and ambiguous. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory as seeking discovery of information that is neither relevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this action nor proportional to the needs of the case. For example, it is unclear why the use or nonuse of machine learning, or an identification and description of “all data and AI/machine learning models obtained, derived, trained and/or validated using data collected by Onavo,” is relevant to Advertisers’ claims or how the scope of the information sought in this Interrogatory is relevant or proportional to those claims. Meta further objects to the Interrogatory as facially overbroad to the extent that it asks Meta to describe “all data and AI/machine learning models,” without limitation for relevance or proportionality. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information not in Meta’s possession, custody or control, and seeks information in a form that Meta does not maintain in the ordinary course of business.

Based on the foregoing objections, Meta responds that it is unable to provide a response to Interrogatory No. 7 as framed. Meta is willing to meet and confer to discuss the relevance and scope of this Interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8

Identify and describe, with specificity, all machine learning and AI systems used to match users while “offsite” (as that word is used at Meta) to their Facebook IDs, Facebook profiles, and/or “shadow” profiles.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

Meta incorporates by reference its General Objections and its Objections to Definitions and Instructions. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory because it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the information sought. Specifically, Meta objects to this Interrogatory as vague and ambiguous because it relies on the undefined terms “machine learning and AI systems,” “match users,” “offsite,” and “shadow” profiles. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory as seeking discovery of information that is neither relevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this action nor proportional to the needs of the case. For example, it is unclear why the use or nonuse of machine learning, or an identification and description of “all machine learning and AI systems used to match users while ‘offsite,’” is relevant to Advertisers’ claims or how the scope of the information sought in this Interrogatory is relevant or proportional to those claims. Meta further objects to the Interrogatory as facially overbroad to the extent that it asks Meta to describe “all data and AI/machine learning models,” without limitation for relevance or proportionality. Meta further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information not in Meta’s possession, custody or control, and seeks information in a form that Meta does not maintain in the ordinary course of business.

Based on the foregoing objections, Meta responds that it is unable to provide a response to Interrogatory No. 8 as framed. Meta is willing to meet and confer to discuss the relevance and scope of this Interrogatory.

Dated: August 24, 2022

By: /s/ Sonal N. Mehta

SONAL N. MEHTA (SBN 222086)
Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**
2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400
Palo Alto, California 94306

Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only

Telephone: (650) 858-6000
Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

DAVID Z. GRINGER (*pro hac vice*)
David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com

**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**

7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
New York, New York 10007

Telephone: (212) 230-8800
Facsimile: (212) 230-8888

ARI HOLTZBLATT (*pro hac vice*)
Ari.Holtzblatt@wilmerhale.com

MOLLY M. JENNINGS (*pro hac vice*)
Molly.Jennings@wilmerhale.com

**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**

1875 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 663-6000
Facsimile: (202) 663-6363

Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.